

Canadian Druggist

WM. J. DYAS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

NOVEMBER 15th, 1894.

The Medical Society's Request.

A number of Toronto druggists were recently surprised to receive a copy of a resolution, which appears elsewhere on this page, passed at a late meeting of the Toronto District Medical Association, in which the general practice by druggists of repeating prescriptions without authority from the prescribing physician was unanimously condemned, and in which they were requested to desist from a continuance of the custom. A meeting of the Druggists' Association was called to consider the matter, but, as it was felt that the Association could not as a body bind its members to any course which they, as individuals, might not care to adhere to, it was considered wisest to leave to each the manner of replying which his judgment and policy dictated.

Enquiry amongst the druggists showed that they felt that the Medical Association had asked too much in requiring a portion of them to stop a practice which was so universal. They were at all times willing to refuse to repeat specific prescriptions which the physician ordered should not be repeated, as, in such cases, he would share with them the responsibility of refusing; otherwise, they felt that they should be permitted to conduct their business as demands determined.

Interviews with prominent physicians elicited the information that while many of them used their own prescription pads, having printed thereon instructions that the medicine ordered should not be repeated, the instructions were not adhered to, and that copies of those prescriptions had in many cases been given by the druggist to their patients. They further claimed that copies thus given were being hawked all over the Province to friends at a distance, and served purposes for which they were never intended. They believed that a practice which had become so general would be difficult to overcome, but thought that the bringing of the matter to the attention of druggists would be productive of good and would lessen an injustice to themselves and a danger to the community.

What Shall the Answer Be?

The Toronto Medical Association's request to the druggists of that city is one which is likely to provoke a considerable amount of feeling and discussion in the ranks of both parties interested. Looking at the matter from the druggists' standpoint, we cannot well see how any druggist could honestly reply his acquiescence. When the druggist receives from his customer a prescription to be filled he feels that he is dealing entirely with that customer and not with any physician, un-

less a scalping arrangement exists between them. He fills the prescription, charges his price, retains the original if permitted to, or returns it or a copy if so requested. If the prescription has written upon it instructions from the prescriber that it is not to be repeated, the instruction certainly binds him in case a renewal is sought, but does not enable him to retain the prescription, which may be dispensed elsewhere and in as many different places as the person having it may desire. When, however, the prescription is given to the druggist by the physician with an order for a delivery of the medicine to the patient, the prescription is in that case subject only to the will of the prescriber, although it is rarely exercised.

When the physician gives into the hands of his patient any prescription his claim to it ceases and is supplanted by a fee charged or paid. That written order for specific medicine represents his skill and value to his patient, and is carefully preserved for that very reason. If the patient does not wish to use it he is at perfect liberty to destroy it, so that his right to possession is unassailable. When he appeared before the physician he brought to him only his individuality and paid him for the prescription written for it. When he afterwards appears before the druggist he brings to him not individuality but a prescription and pays him for the medicine he supplies upon it—in both cases only paying for what he did not bring to either, and retaining what neither has the slightest claim to,—the prescription.

Having reached this point we get back to the question at issue. The physician wants the druggist to stop repeating. He cannot ask his former patient not to have his prescription repeated because that party is absolutely independent and can do as he pleases. The druggist, being in a measure dependent upon the good will of the prescriber, has, perforce, to check his independence of spirit and co-operate. In those cases where a refusal to repeat would be for the benefit of the party refused, it would be well to do so, but, if for no better purpose than to fatten the field we most unhesitatingly say no. What shall the answer be?

Physicians Denounce Repetition.

The West Toronto Medical Territorial Division Association, composed of all licensed practitioners of medicine residing west of Yonge street, Toronto, Ont., held their regular meeting a short time ago in Broadway Hall on Spadina avenue, with Dr. George H. Carveth acting as Secretary.

That it was an important meeting will be readily seen by the following resolution, which was moved and seconded by prominent West End physicians and carried unanimously:

Resolved, "That the secretary be instructed to write all the druggists west of Yonge street, informing them that the matter of repeating prescriptions without

authority had been formally considered by this association and unanimously condemned, and that each and every one of the druggists be asked if he will desist from this time the practice of repeating prescriptions without the knowledge and consent of the prescribing physician."

As Outsiders View It.

One of the Patron leaders says that the next move of the physicians will be to ask for legislation to prohibit druggists from filling a prescription more than once. The result of this would be to increase materially the receipts of doctors, since it would be necessary to pay for a fresh prescription each time the medicine was required to be duplicated. If such a proposal is entertained, which is extremely unlikely, it might as well be abandoned, since the Legislature would not consider it for a moment. It looks as if some one had been making a man of straw for Mr. Haycock and his followers to combat.—*Toronto Mail.*

Doctors, Dentists and Druggists.

They are a drug in the market. You find them in every hole and corner, especially in our cities, many of them having all the evidence externally of hard times. In Quebec, it is the ambition of the *habitant*, who perhaps can neither read nor write, to make some of his sons priests doctors or lawyers. It seems to us that this thing is overdone in Canada, especially in Ontario and Quebec. It is only by raising the standard that it can be restrained. Unfortunately, however, there seems to be a factious desire to cheapen education. We fully expect to see our profession reduced again to the ranks of the peddling "tooth-carpenter."—*Dominion Dental Journal.*

Drug Store Burglars in Toronto.

The noise of the falling of a large pane of glass, which had been neatly removed and placed standing on end by burglars, probably saved Mr. A. M. Dow, at the corner of Augusta avenue and St. Patrick street, about \$200. Mr. Dow reported to the police that his drug store had been entered during the night and \$40 worth of perfumes taken. The burglars had worked under the full glare of an electric light. They removed a heavy plate glass panel from the front door, and, after placing it on end on the pavement, entered. While they were operating inside the pane, which leaned against the door, fell, and the crash evidently frightened them off the premises.

When Mr. Dow's clerk came to the store at 7.30 in the morning, he found the glass smashed to atoms, and about \$200 worth of goods, which had been taken from the drawers, lying piled up behind the counter. The proprietor states